

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 18-19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roccetti et al (“Roccetti”). Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen et al. (US 2004/0044731A1) (“K. Chen”). Claims 5-8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Langseth et al. (U.S. 6,671,715) (“Langseth”). Claims 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Y. Chen et al. (iMobile EE: an enterprise mobile service platform”, July 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 9, Issue 4) (“Y. Chen”). Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen. Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Langseth. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Y. Chen. Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen. Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Langseth. Claim 25 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Y. Chen. Claims 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Wright et al. (US 6,442,598) (“Wright”).

Claims 1-7, 11-13, 15, 18-21 and 23 have been amended. Applicants submit that no new matter was introduced in the amendment of the claims.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ representatives, Kenneth Eiferman and Peter Hernandez, and Examiners Michael Lai and Tuan Ho participated in a telephonic interview on August 14, 2007 to discuss the present claim amendments. Agreement was reached. Examiners Pham Lai and Ho stated that the present claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 18-19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roccetti et al (“Roccetti”). Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention. As described in the specification (see page 4, col. [0020] to col. [0025] in association with FIG. 4, in the present application, a user using a device such as a web-enabled device communicates with a server (e.g., logs on and is authenticated). Once the user is logged on, he is provided by the server with a list of available content. In one illustrative example, the user then provides information to the server such as a fax number or address to the server where the content is to be delivered to. Once received, the server sends the selected content to the desired fax number or address.

Claim 1 now recites **“sending information to the server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices which are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content”** and **“electronically transmitting from the server the selected accessible content to the one or more designated devices not including the web-enabled device”**. Unlike that which is now claimed, the cited Roccetti et al. reference fails to teach or suggest the above added limitations. As mentioned in page 1068, col. 2, paragraph 2 of Roccetti, when Roccetti requests a certain MP3 song from the server, the server via the Download manager sends the requested song back to Roccetti if it is available. There is no teaching or suggestion in Roccetti of the user requesting a particular content for another device (“designated devices”) as it is now claimed in each of the claims. Independent claim 18 has been also amended to further clarify that the content selected by the web-enabled device is sent to one or more other devices (**“and electronically transmitting the selected content to the designated device selected by the web-enabled device”**).

Given that the cited Roccetti et al. reference fails to teach or suggest sending the content to any other device but the device that requested the content, it is believed that claims 1-2, 18-19 and 26 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen et al. (US 2004/0044731A1) (“K. Chen”). Claims 5-8 and 11

were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Langseth et al. (U.S. 6,671,715) (“Langseth”). Claims 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Y. Chen et al. (iMobile EE: an enterprise mobile service platform”, July 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 9, Issue 4) (“Y. Chen”). Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen. Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Langseth. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Y. Chen. Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of K. Chen. Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Langseth. Claim 25 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Y. Chen. Claims 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Wright et al. (US 6,442,598) (“Wright”).

In view of the above previously made comments directed to the main cited Roccetti reference and its failure to teach to suggest some of the key recited language in the present claims, and the further failure of the other cited references to teach or suggest these claim elements, it is believed that the other claims 3-17, 20-25 and 27-28 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: 302767.1 / MSFT-2571
Application No.: 10/692,435
Office Action Dated: June 7, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: September 7, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439